REMARKS

Claims 1 and 14 are amended in order to advance this case to its allowance. Support for the amended subject matter can be found, for example, on page 4, lines 26 – 28 of the International Publication WO 2005/006326 A2 of the International Application Number PCT/IB2004/051126, the present application being the US national phase thereof. No new matter has been added.

According to the Office Action, claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In particular, the examiner states that the phrase "by a function which is computationally hard or infeasible to invert" allegedly renders the claims indefinite. Claims 2, 3 and 5 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 merely by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Claims 9, 11 – 13 and 15 are allowable.

Applicant's representative appreciates the examiner's suggestion to replace the above-mentioned phrase as proposed in the Office Action. However, the examiner's suggestion is respectfully declined for the following reason. The suggested limitation of "by a function whose inverse is NP-complete" is not supported by the instant specification. It is neither described nor suggested in the Applicant's specification. Hence, the introduction of such limitation into the Applicant's claims may be considered new matter and not allowed under the current US patent law and practice.

To expedite the prosecution of the application and without conceding any statements or waiving any arguments in the Office Action, claims 1 and 14 are amended to remove the "or" ambiguity. It is respectfully submitted that the currently amended limitation "by a function which is computationally infeasible to invert" is fully compliant with 35 USC §112, second paragraph. The phrase "computationally infeasible" has plain meaning, which is clear and unambiguous to a person skilled in the area of computational complexity theory as defined, for example, in Wikipedia.

In addition, a person skilled in cryptography understands this phrase to mean "a certain computation taking a very long time to compute using the fastest (super) computers." See, for example, a publication entitled "Cryptography in Internet Security" by Prabhaker Mateti, 2011; or "Cracking the Code" by Keith Devlin, February, 2006. Both publications can be easily found on the web, and contain a definition for the phrase "computationally infeasible."

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 14 are now fully compliant with 35 USC §112, second paragraph, because the phrase "computationally infeasible" is not vague or indefinite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 – 8 are fully compliant with 35 U.S.C. §112 by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a telephonic interview, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian S. Myers
Myers Wolin, LLC
Registration No.: 46,947
973-401-7157

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001